

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated April 5, 2004, which was paper #11 of the present application. This amendment is filed with a petition for extension of time that extends the time for response to August 5, 2004. Claims 1-53 are pending. Claims 52 and 53 are added. Claims 12, 26 and 29 are amended to correct typographical errors. Claim 6 is amended to replace that claim. No other amendments are offered. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

The application describes methods and systems that allow the registrant of a plurality of domain names to view and directly manage the domain records corresponding to these domain names and to effect changes to these domain records in a DNS root server. In a preferred embodiment, one method provides a view of a domain management function screen that lists a number of domain names registered to one user and also lists a number of different domain management functions. Such an embodiment allows the user to see a number of domain names and manage those domain names through a series of menus starting from the base menu. Managing a plurality of domain names, in part by displaying them together on a management function select screen or view of a graphical user interface, is neither taught nor suggested by the cited art.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-51 over U.S. Patent No. 5,958,052 to Bellovin, et al. (the Bellovin patent) taken in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,338,082 to Schneider (the Schneider patent). Applicants submit that the Bellovin patent, whether taken alone or in combination with the Schneider patent, neither describes nor suggests the inventions defined by the presently pending claims. Briefly, the Bellovin patent pertains to a DNS proxy device that acts as part of a firewall, while the present application describes a domain manager that allows users to manage and modify existing domain name registrations and associated information.

By contrast, the claimed invention generates on a client computer a display listing a plurality of domain names whose properties can be modified. The display also lists domain management functions that can be applied to the listed domain names. Implementations of the claimed invention provide a graphical interface driven system that allows users to readily manage a number of domain names and to apply time saving techniques to the management functions. For example, in an implementation of claim 1, a user might change the technical contact information for one domain name and then apply that change to another domain listed on the domain management screen in a simplified process. There is nothing like a domain management system in the cited art and the claims distinguish over the art of record.

There is no suggestion in the Bellovin patent of a system or method that allows a user to directly manage multiple domain names. Rather, the Bellovin patent is directed to a DNS proxy that intercepts DNS requests in a manner that prevents them from being misdirected or misused by a malicious intruder. See Bellovin patent, col. 6, lines 25-39. In other words, the Bellovin patent describes an improved firewall, which has nothing to do with the claimed method of managing plural domain name records.

The Office Action errs in its characterization of the Bellovin patent in a number of ways. The Office Action refers to FIG. 3 of the Bellovin patent as showing the listing of a plurality of domain names on a display. This is incorrect. FIG. 3 of the Bellovin patent shows the tree structure of a URL addressing system. Nothing in FIG. 3 is displayed and there is no reason it would ever be displayed. Rather FIG. 3 shows a logical addressing system and the hierarchical organization of domain names and URLs. Consequently, the Bellovin patent does not meet claim 1's recitation of "providing on a client machine a domain management function select screen listing a plurality of domain names."

The Office Action refers to col. 3, line 55 to col. 4, line 40 of the Bellovin patent as showing a display listing a plurality of domain management functions.

This is not correct. The referenced passage of the Bellovin patent does not describe any displays and does not describe any lists of domain management functions. Rather, the referenced passage provides a background description of how computers are addressed over the Internet. Tables 1 and 2 are tables internal to a name server or to a cache that are used for translating URLs or domain names into IP addresses or IP addresses to domain names or URLs. Tables 1 and 2 are also never displayed according to the Bellovin patent and there would never be a reason to display these tables. Rather, these are tables internal to the name server or cache and are used without user knowledge or intervention. Consequently, the Bellovin patent does not meet claim 1's recitation of "providing on a client machine a domain management function select screen ... listing a plurality of user selectable domain management functions." There is no such display and no such listing in the Bellovin patent.

Nor is there any reason to display any of the information of the Bellovin patent referenced by the Office Action. All of the referenced information relates to the addressing of computers. That is not displayed and is generally transparent to users on client machines. Consequently, it would not be obvious to alter the Bellovin patent to display the referenced information. The Schneider patent does not suggest modifying the Bellovin patent's system. The Schneider patent's teachings are wholly separate from those of the Bellovin patent – there is no overlap in their teachings and no suggestion in the Schneider patent to change anything about the Bellovin patent. This can be seen most readily by the fact that the Schneider patent's system could be used within the network described within the Bellovin patent without changing anything about the Schneider patent's system or the Bellovin patent's network.

In addition, the referenced section of the Bellovin patent has nothing that could be called a domain management function. The referenced section of the Bellovin patent discusses looking up domain names and translating domain names into IP addresses. Nothing in the referenced section of the Bellovin patent

discusses changing any of the information related to a domain name within a database or within a DNS root server.

The Office Action continues by stating that the Bellovin patent teaches “causing the records in the DNS root server to be substantially in agreement with the modified database records,” referring to col. 8, lines 1-41 of the Bellovin patent. Column 8, lines 1-41 of the Bellovin patent describe transactions that are intercepted by the DNS proxy 404 so that they do not pass to a DNS name server. The referenced passage does not refer to changing records in the DNS root servers and do not even discuss the DNS root servers. In fact, the referenced passage describes a system that specifically avoids contacting the DNS name servers and the described operations could never change the records in a DNS root server. Consequently, the Bellovin patent also fails to teach claim 1’s recitation of “causing the records in the DNS root server to be substantially in agreement with the modified database records.”

The following summarizes how the claims of the application distinguish over the cited art.

The Claims Distinguish over the Prior Art

Claims 1-13 distinguish over the cited prior art by reciting “providing on a client machine a domain management function select screen listing a plurality of domain names including a first domain name and a second domain name and listing a plurality of user selectable domain management functions.” This allows the efficient management of a number of domain names at once. Nothing similar is described in the Bellovin patent, which describes a DNS proxy and an improved firewall. Nothing similar is described in the Schneider patent, which operates within the context of the address line of a conventional browser for a single entered domain name. None of the other references of record teach or suggestion the

invention of claim 1. As such, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-13 distinguish over the art of record and are in condition for allowance.

Claim 14 is directed to a method that uses a graphical user interface to show current information related to a domain name record and to show a user's options for changing that record. The changes are then propagated to the DNS root server. Claim 14 distinguishes over the art of record by reciting "providing on a first computer a domain management function view of a graphical user interface (GUI), the domain management function view listing an active domain and a plurality of user selectable domain management functions." The Bellovin and Schneider patents do not discuss or suggest anything with respect to providing user access to a plurality of domain management functions through a graphical user interface. Consequently, claim 14 and its dependent claims 15-33 distinguish over the art of record and are in condition for allowance.

Claim 34 is directed to a computer program that uses a graphical user interface to show current information related to a domain name record and then show a user's options for changing that record. The changes are propagated to the DNS root server. Claim 34 distinguishes over the cited prior art by reciting "program code for displaying a domain management function select view listing a registrant name, an active domain and a plurality of user selectable domain management functions." The Bellovin and Schneider patents do not discuss or suggest anything with respect to providing user access to a plurality of domain management functions through a graphical user interface. Consequently, claim 34 and its dependent claims 35-42 distinguish over the art of record and are in condition for allowance.

Finally, claims 43-51 distinguish over the art of record by reciting "providing on a first computer a domain management function select screen identifying a registrant name, an active domain and a plurality of user selectable domain management functions."

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and entrance of these amendments are respectfully requested.


If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6742 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: August 4, 2004

By: _____


William H. Wright
Registration No. 36,312
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701